



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,145	10/20/2003	Benjamin Quigley	AOL0055	6038
22862 7590 06/08/2009 GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L MENLO PARK, CA 94025				
EXAMINER WONG, ERIC TAK WAI				
ART UNIT 3693		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 06/08/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/690,145

Applicant(s)

QUIGLEY ET AL

Examiner

ERIC T. WONG

Art Unit

3693

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 22-42 and 44-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 22-42 and 44-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20, 22-42, and 44-80 are pending. Claims 1, 15, 22-23, 37, and 44 are currently amended. Claims 21 and 43 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Examiner's note: Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the **entire** reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the content of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

3. Claims 1-6, 10-11, 23-28, 32-33, 50-56, 60-61 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "Random Deposit".

Regarding claim 1, "Random Deposit" teaches providing an account, the account a first account type (unverified account) providing a first set of services (receiving payments), the first set of services requiring a first level of authentication (username/password); presenting an accountholder a one-time challenge/response mechanism (random deposit method); and if the accountholder clears the challenge, converting the account to a second account type for all time (verified account); wherein the second type provides the first set of services (receiving

payments) plus further services associated therewith (funding payments), the further services requiring at least one further level of authentication (random deposit method); wherein the first account type comprises a thin wallet, the thin wallet comprising a record in a subscriber database, and wherein the second account type comprises a full wallet, the full wallet comprising a record in a wallet database. "Random Deposit" states that a verified account is needed to fund payments while an unverified user can still received payments. Therefore, an unverified account is a first account type which is a "thin wallet" and a verified account is a second account type which is a "full wallet".

Regarding claim 2, "Random Deposit" further teaches wherein the challenge/response mechanism requires an accountholder to provide information known only to the accountholder.

Regarding claim 3, "Random Deposit" further teaches providing the wallet account comprises either of the steps of: creating the account when making an initial purchase; and creating a record in a subscriber database.

Regarding claim 4, "Random Deposit" further teaches wherein subscribers include subscribers to any of: an online services and an ISP (Internet Service Provider).

Regarding claim 5, "Random Deposit" further teaches wherein the step of presenting a challenge/response mechanism comprises steps of: requesting a service from within the account

of the first type that is only available from within an account of the second type; and prompting the accountholder to provide the information known only to the accountholder.

Regarding claim 6, "Random Deposit" further teaches wherein the account comprises an electronic wallet, the first type comprising a thin wallet wherein the first set of services comprises at least one low-risk task requiring a low security level.

Regarding claims 10-11, "Random Deposit" teaches authenticating at the first level to gain access to the first account; wherein authenticating at the first level comprises providing a user ID and a first-level password.

Regarding claim 50, "Random Deposit" teaches a wallet server; a wallet database; a subscriber database; wherein the wallet server is in communication with the wallet and the subscriber databases; wherein the wallet server is in communication with the wallet and the subscriber databases; and a client in communication with the wallet server, wherein a wallet accountholder requests services from the wallet server; wherein the server includes means for converting the electronic wallet.

Regarding claims 23-28, 32-33, 51-56, 60-61, the claims are drawn to a computer readable medium comprising instructions for executing the methods or to systems which perform methods of the aforementioned claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 45 and 76 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Random Deposit” in view of Schell (US Patent 6,477,648).

Regarding claims 45 and 76, "Random Deposit" does not explicitly teach accessing an account from a client device previously established as trusted.

Schell teaches accessing an account from a client device previously established as trusted (see abstract, MAC address). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of converting of "Random Deposit" further with accessing an account from a client device previously established as trusted. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification for the benefit of increased security.

5. Claims 46-48 and 77-79 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Random Deposit” in view of Schell, further in view of Applicant admission of prior art.

Regarding claims 46 and 77, "Random Deposit" does not explicitly teach establishing a client as trusted comprises authentication with a second-level password.

Applicant admission of prior art teaches establishing a client as trusted by means of authentication with a second-level password (see page 3 of specification starting with "Conventionally, digital wallets..."). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of converting of "Random Deposit" further with establishing a client as trusted by authenticating with a second-level password. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification for the benefit of increased security.

Regarding claim 47 and 78, Applicant admission of prior art teaches re-establishing a client as trusted if a trusted state is compromised is old and well known in the art. Examiner notes that the limitation is taken as Applicant admission of prior art since Applicant did not adequately traverse the Official Notice taken in the prior Office action (see "Response to Arguments" below). Based upon a technical line of reasoning which is clear and unmistakable, if a client is found to be untrusted, it would not only have been obvious to re-establish trust with the client, but expected in order to continue providing services to the customer in a secure fashion. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification for the benefit of customer satisfaction and maintaining a profit stream.

Regarding claim 48 and 79, "Random Deposit" does not explicitly teach providing a visual indicator of a trusted state.

Applicant admission of prior art teaches that providing a visual indicator is old and well known in the art (eg. “Login successful message”). Examiner notes that the limitation is taken as Applicant admission of prior art since Applicant did not adequately traverse the Official Notice taken in the prior Office action (see “Response to Arguments” below). It would have been obvious to modify the method of converting of “Random Deposit” further with including visual indicator of a trusted state with motivation being that it is convenient for a user to know whether or not he/she is authenticated with the system.

6. Claims 49 and 80 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Random Deposit” in view of Schell, further in view of Alao (US PG-Pub US 20020147645 A1).

Regarding claims 49 and 80, “Random Deposit” does not explicitly teach providing a security controls panel that permits accountholders to manage authentication for various online products and sites.

Alao teaches providing a security controls panel that permits accountholders to manage authentication for various online products and sites (see paragraph 49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method for converting of “Random Deposit” further with providing a security controls panel that permits accountholders to manage authentication for various online products and sites. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification for the benefit of user control (eg. parental control).

7. Claims 14, 36, 64 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Random Deposit” in view of Applicant admission of prior art.

Regarding claims 14, 36, and 64, “Random Deposit” teaches configuring the challenge by an account provider, wherein configuring the challenge includes: specifying information requested by the challenge. “Random Deposit” does not explicitly teach specifying a permissible number of response attempts.

Applicant admission of prior art teaches that specifying a permissible number of response attempts in a security process was old and well known at the time of invention (eg. Microsoft Windows password lockout). Examiner notes that the limitation is taken as Applicant admission of prior art since Applicant did not adequately traverse the Official Notice taken in the prior Office action (see “Response to Arguments” below). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of converting of “Random Deposit” further with specifying a permissible number of response attempts. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to prevent brute force attempts to provide the correct answer.

8. Claims 73-75 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Random Deposit” in view of Alao.

Regarding claims 73-75, “Random Deposit” does not explicitly teach a second server, said second server operative to relay data and requests between said wallet server and said subscriber database; a router, the router operative to link at least a first and a second network, wherein the wallet server occupies the first network and wherein the second server and the subscriber database occupy the second network; wherein the wallet database occupies said second network.

Also teaches a second server, said second server operative to relay data and requests between said wallet server and said subscriber database; a router, the router operative to link at least a first and a second network, wherein the wallet server occupies the first network and wherein the second server and the subscriber database occupy the second network; wherein the wallet database occupies said second network (see abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of “Random Deposit” to include a second server, said second server operative to relay data and requests between said wallet server and said subscriber database; a router, the router operative to link at least a first and a second network, wherein the wallet server occupies the first network and wherein the second server and the subscriber database occupy the second network; wherein the wallet database occupies said second network. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to secure personal information on a separate server.

9. Claims 12-13, 34-35, 62-63 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Random Deposit” in view of Alao, further in view of Applicant admission of prior art.

Regarding claims 12-13, “Random Deposit” does not explicitly teach wherein the information known only to the account holder comprises at least a portion of a credit card number stored in the first account;

Alao teaches wherein the information known only to the account holder comprises at least a portion of a credit card number stored in the first account (see paragraph 75). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of converting of “Random Deposit” further with wherein the information known only to the account holder comprises at least a portion of a credit card number stored in the first account. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification for the benefit of increased security.

“Random Deposit” does not explicitly teach if the account holder doesn’t clear the challenge, allowing a predetermined number of attempts to enter the information known only to the account holder; if the account holder fails the predetermined number of attempts, allowing the account holder to provide a new credit card number; and presenting a challenge based on the new credit card number.

Applicant admission of prior art teaches that specifying a permissible number of response attempts in a security process was old and well known at the time of invention (eg. Microsoft Windows password lockout). Examiner notes that the limitation is taken as Applicant admission

of prior art since Applicant did not adequately traverse the Official Notice taken in the prior Office action (see "Response to Arguments" below).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of converting of "Random Deposit" further with if the account holder doesn't clear the challenge, allowing a predetermined number of attempts to enter the information known only to the account holder. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to prevent brute force attempts at guessing the correct answer.

Also teaches storing multiple credit card numbers for the consumer to choose from (see paragraph 99).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of converting of "Random Deposit" further with if the account holder fails the predetermined number of attempts, allowing the account holder to provide a new credit card number; and presenting a challenge based on the new credit card number. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification for convenience, i.e. a user may not remember the information to one credit card, but may still remember the information to another.

Regarding claims 34-35 and 62-63, the claims are drawn to a computer readable medium comprising instructions for executing the methods or to systems which perform the method of the aforementioned claims.

10. Claims 7-9, 15, 29-31, 37, 57-59, 65 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Random Deposit” in view of “User Agreement”.

Regarding claims 7-9, “Random Deposit” does not explicitly teach wherein the at least one low-risk task comprises any of: making purchases not exceeding a predetermined purchase amount; making transactions using default account information; and making purchases at sites requiring only the first level of authentication; wherein the second type comprises a full wallet and the further rights comprise additional tasks requiring greater security than the low level of security; wherein the additional tasks comprise any of: editing the default account information; editing account preferences; making purchases that exceed a predetermined purchase amount; and making purchases at sites that require the at least one level of further authentication.

“User Agreement” teaches wherein the at least one low-risk task comprises any of: making purchases not exceeding a predetermined purchase amount (setting limit on unverified account); making transactions using default account information; and making purchases at sites requiring only the first level of authentication; wherein the second type comprises a full wallet and the further rights comprise additional tasks requiring greater security than the low level of security; wherein the additional tasks comprise any of: editing the default account information; editing account preferences; making purchases that exceed a predetermined purchase amount; and making purchases at sites that require the at least one level of further authentication.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of converting of “Random Deposit” with wherein the at least one low-risk task comprises any of: making purchases not exceeding a predetermined purchase amount

(sending limit on unverified account); making transactions using default account information; and making purchases at sites requiring only the first level of authentication; wherein the second type comprises a full wallet and the further rights comprise additional tasks requiring greater security than the low level of security; wherein the additional tasks comprise any of: editing the default account information; editing account preferences; making purchases that exceed a predetermined purchase amount; and making purchases at sites that require the at least one level of further authentication. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification in order to mitigate fraud.

Regarding claim 15, "Random Deposit" teaches creating a record in a wallet account database but does not explicitly teach providing notice of a privacy policy; and consenting to the privacy policy by the account holder.

"User Agreement" teaches providing notice of a privacy policy; and consenting to the privacy policy by the account holder. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of converting of "Random Deposit" with providing notice of a privacy policy; and consenting to the privacy policy by the account holder. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification for the benefit of protection from liability.

Regarding claims 29-31, 37, 57-59, 65, the claims are drawn to a computer readable medium comprising instructions for executing the methods or to systems which perform the method of the aforementioned claims.

11. Claims 16-18, 38-40, 66-68 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Random Deposit” in view of “User Agreement”, further in view of Applicant admission of prior art.

Regarding claims 16-18, "Random Deposit" does not explicitly teach creating a second-level challenge; setting a second-level password; and configuring a security question by the accountholder.

Applicant admission of prior art teaches creating a second-level challenge; setting a second-level password; configuring a security question by the accountholder; providing the second-level password; and clearing the security question. (for second-level password see page 3 of specification starting with “Conventionally, digital wallets...”, for security question see page 3 of specification starting discussing hierarchy of queries in US Patent 6,263,447). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of converting of “Random Deposit” further with creating a second-level challenge; setting a second-level password; configuring a security question by the accountholder; providing the second-level password; and clearing the security question. (for second-level password see page 3 of specification starting with “Conventionally, digital wallets...”, for security question see page 3 of specification starting discussing hierarchy of queries in US Patent 6,263,447). One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification for the benefit of increased

security since it was old and well known in the art to layer different types of security in order to increase overall security.

Regarding claims 38-40 and 66-68, the claims are drawn to a computer readable medium comprising instructions for executing the methods or to systems which perform the method of the aforementioned claims.

12. Claims 19-22, 41-42, 44, 69-72 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Random Deposit” in view of “User Agreement”, further in view of Applicant Admission of prior art, further in view of Alao.

Regarding claim 19, “Random Deposit” does not explicitly teach providing a user interface accessible only to holders of accounts of the second type to edit account information and preferences.

Alao teaches providing a user interface to holders of accounts to edit account information and preferences (see paragraph 47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of converting of “Random Deposit” further with providing a user interface accessible only to holders of accounts of the second type to edit account information and preferences. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification for the benefit of increased security.

Regarding claim 20, "Random Deposit" does not explicitly teach wherein the account information comprises any of: first name; middle initial; last name; credit card type; credit card number; credit card expiration date; billing address; city; state; postal code; country; daytime phone; and evening phone.

Also teaches wherein the account information comprises any of: first name; middle initial; last name; credit card type; credit card number; credit card expiration date; billing address; city; state; postal code; country; daytime phone; and evening phone (see paragraph 47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of converting of "Random Deposit" further with wherein the account information comprises any of: first name; middle initial; last name; credit card type; credit card number; credit card expiration date; billing address; city; state; postal code; country; daytime phone; and evening phone. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification because some of the necessary information to make a purchase may need to be updated.

Regarding claim 22, "Random Deposit" teaches providing a wallet server, wherein the wallet server comprises a web server having a wallet application running thereon, the wallet server operative to pull account information from either the subscriber database or the wallet database.

Regarding claims 41-42, 44, and 69-72, the claims are drawn to a computer readable medium comprising instructions for executing the methods or to systems which perform the method of the aforementioned claims.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant argues that “Random Deposit” doesn’t mention a single word about a data model, or a physical design of a database. Therefore, the limitation “wherein first account type comprises a thin wallet, the thin wallet comprising a record in a subscriber database, and wherein the second account type comprises a full wallet, the full wallet comprising a record in a wallet database” is not taught by the reference (see pg. 17 of Remarks).

The argument is not found persuasive for the following reason. As per MPEP 700, for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or **impliedly**. The “Random Deposit” reference describes a method for verifying a Paypal account. The reference further states that a verified account is needed to fund payments while an unverified user can still received payments. Therefore, an unverified account is a first account type which is a "thin wallet" and a verified account is a second account type which is a “full wallet”. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have known that Paypal accounts comprise records in a subscriber database, ie. the reference implies that the accounts are records in a subscriber database.

14. Applicant states “For the record, Applicant respectfully traverses any and all factual assertions in the file that are not supported by documentary evidence. Such include assertions

based on findings of inherency, assertions based on Official Notice, and any other assertions of what is well known or commonly known in the prior art.” (see pg. 19 of Remarks).

As per MPEP 2144.03,

C. If Applicant Challenges a Factual Assertion as Not Properly Officially Noticed or Not Properly Based Upon Common Knowledge, the Examiner Must Support the Finding With Adequate Evidence

To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner’s action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b). See also Chevenard, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241 (“[I]n the absence of any demand by appellant for the examiner to produce authority for his statement, we will not consider this contention.”). A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without any reference to the examiner’s assertion of official notice would be inadequate. If applicant adequately traverses the examiner’s assertion of official notice, the examiner must provide documentary evidence in the next Office action if the rejection is to be maintained. See 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). See also Zurko, 258 F.3d at 1386, 59 USPQ2d at 1697 (“[T]he Board [or examiner] must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of these findings” to satisfy the substantial evidence test). If the examiner is relying on personal knowledge to support the finding of what is known in the art, the examiner must provide an affidavit or declaration setting forth specific factual statements and explanation to support the finding. See 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2). If applicant does not traverse the examiner’s assertion of official notice or applicant’s traverse is not adequate, the examiner should clearly indicate in the next Office action that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner’s assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate. If the traverse was inadequate, the examiner should include an explanation as to why it was inadequate.

Applicant’s statement is an inadequate traversal of the Official Notice taken in the prior Office action because it fails to state why the noticed facts are not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. Therefore, the limitations which were noticed are now considered Applicant admission of prior art.

15. Applicant states that the Examiner offers no line of reasoning supporting an unverified account being implicitly described by the reference (see pg. 20 of Remarks).

The argument is not persuasive because as pointed out in the prior Office action, the prior art teaches verifying an account. One skilled in the art would have appreciated that an account is unverified before it is verified, ie. an unverified account is **implied**.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ERIC T. WONG whose telephone number is 571-270-3405. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James A. Kramer can be reached on 571-272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James A. Kramer/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3693

ERIC T. WONG
Examiner
Art Unit 3693

May 26, 2009